

**Remarks:**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on March 18, 2004, which was paper #5 of the present application. Reexamination and early favorable reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action comments that the declaration does not identify the citizenship of each inventor and does not identify the residence city and state of each inventor. Neither of these comments is accurate. Applicant attaches a copy of the declaration filed in response to the notice of missing parts. Citizenship (in the table, below the word "CITIZENSHIP"), residence city (in the table, below the phrase "Residence: CITY") and residence state (in the table, below the phrase "STATE or COUNTRY") are listed for each of the five inventors on the first page of the declaration. The basis for the Office Action's comments on the declaration is not understood.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-15 over U.S. Patent No. 6,564,216 to Waters. Applicant submits that the Waters patent neither teaches nor suggests the present invention. In particular, the Waters patent does not teach the system for managing domains and verifying changes defined by the claims of the present application. The Waters patent does not describe any mechanism to determine if an operator or user has the authority to modify the information for a domain name. The Waters patent does not describe any mechanism to authenticate an operator's authority to modify the information for a domain name. Rather, the Waters patent only discusses the configuration of a computer network.

The present application describes a system that allows an operator to act as an agent for managing zone and other domain information for the registrants of

different domains. Such a system is useful, for example, if a company wants to contract with a vendor to manage all of the company's domain registrations.

A preferred implementation of a domain manager identifies a domain name as active and preferably determines if the operator is authorized to make changes for the active domain name. This may proceed in part by collecting authentication information through an interface. When the operator initially registered the domain name for the registrant through the domain manager, the operator is preferably automatically recognized as authoritative for that domain name. An operator is also preferably recognized as authoritative when the operator has previously accessed the domain manager and received authentication for that particular domain name.

Sometimes when operators are not already recognized as authoritative, further authentication may be required. Preferred embodiments of the domain manager recognize that an operator lacks authority and preferably issue a screen to request further authentication to be confirmed by the administrative contact for the domain name. For example, the domain manager may send an e-mail to the administrative contact for the domain name and wait for confirmation from the administrative contact that authorization is proper. Upon authorization, such embodiments of the domain manager recognize the operator as the authoritative zone and technical contact for that domain name.

Claim 1 distinguishes over the Waters patent by reciting "means for determining if the party has authority to alter information about the active domain name and, if the party lacks authority for the active domain name, determining if the party should be given authority for the active domain name." The Waters patent does not provide any mechanism for altering information about a domain name. Rather, the Waters patent describes a network with dynamic assignment of

IP addresses. A central database 204 contains network configuration information, including DNS and DHCP parameters. Access to the central database 204 is controlled through the server manager 201. The server manager 201 determines how the different computers on the network are addressed and how those computers access the central database.

The Waters patent teaches nothing about domain name management. Several of the computers on the Waters patent network may be DNS servers, but DNS servers simply provide DNS information and do not provide mechanisms for changing domain name information. Moreover, the Waters patent provides no facility for generating interfaces to make a domain name active, to request authentication from a user or to accept a request to change information. All of these aspects of a domain management system are recited by claim 1. As such, claim 1, which is directed to domain name management, and its dependent claims 2-6 distinguish over the Waters patent and are in condition for allowance.

Claim 7 and its dependent claims 8-20 are directed to a domain management system. Nothing in the Waters patent relates to a "request for input from an operator ... of a domain name to be an active domain name," or to a request to change information about the active domain name, or to display "a screen confirming execution of the information change request." No display screens are described in the Waters patent and the Waters patent provides no teachings related to changing information related to a domain name. As such, claims 7-20 distinguish over the Waters patent and are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

Appl. No. 09/587,403  
Amdt. Dated June 18, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of March 18, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81866.0025  
Customer No.: 26021

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6700 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: June 18, 2004

By: 

William H. Wright  
Registration No. 36,312  
Attorney for Applicant

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Phone: 213-337-6700  
Fax: 213-337-6701